



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0399OH-1 for Hilliard City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district's HS2020 plan, included in its appendix, was developed in 2007 and lays out a comprehensive and clear vision for reform. A clear picture is painted as to what will be required of today's students in the future, what it will take to get them there, and how that should look and feel in the classroom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vision laid out in this document describes a compelling school setting where students experience learning and develop skills to continue their learning once they complete their K-12 education experience. • The HS2020 report provides specific recommendations for brining the classroom experience into the 21st century and for equipping students with the necessary skills to thrive in this landscape. The recommendations are comprehensive and center around 12 key areas and include things like adapting curriculum, common assessments, and redefining the role of technology, for example. These specific recommendations help paint a clear vision of what this district would look like when structured to provide personalized learning experiences for students. <p>The applicant's vision builds on the four core assurance areas as evidenced by the 12 key areas outlined in the HS2020 report. Within those 12 areas, there are specific recommendations that address all four of the core assurances. The applicant also outlines within the narrative some of the components of the HS2020 that have already been executed (for example, adoption of the Common Core State Standards, a local Data Team Network, and a Kindergarten Intervention program) that align well with the core four assurances.</p> <p>While the vision outlined in the HS2020 plan is clear and comprehensive, what is lacking is a vision and clear approach to the specific reforms that will be executed in this Race to the Top-District proposal. While there is information in Section C on what execution would look like for the three specific projects to be funded through this grant, the district does not paint a clear vision for the execution of these specific activities. There is no information as to why these specific projects were chosen, or as to why and how these three projects will move student achievement and close gaps. Without this information, it is hard to understand the connection between the HS2020 vision and the proposals in the application and feels slightly disjointed.</p> <p>Criterion A1 scores in the medium range because, while there is a clear big picture vision that the district is trying to accomplish, the dots are not well connected between that vision, the things they've implemented since the plan was released, and the rationale for choosing to implement these three specific projects, making it difficult to understand the vision for this particular proposal, and how it will impact student achievement and close gaps.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the district explains that all 20 schools will have participating students, a large component of its plan involves converting 7 schools through a transformation process, and it would have been helpful had the applicant described its rationale for selecting the schools to undergo the transformation to further the case for why this approach will support high-quality implementation.</p> <p>The district also does not identify or explain the method that will be used to select students for participation, or to ensure priority for historically underperforming subgroups. Without this information, it is difficult to assess the district's rationale for their approach or how it will lead to student success. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The table on page 21 indicates that 31.3% of students in the participating schools will be a part of the program, but gives no information as to the selection process for identifying those students. • The district describes that priority will be given to students in subgroups in which achievement gaps have historically been the highest, but doesn't describe how it will ensure that priority or why they have chosen this approach. <p>Overall, sub-criterion A2 is rated medium-low because, while the district describes the schools that will participate and indicates priority for</p>		

low-performing students, the rationale for why this structure was chosen, how it will lead to a high-quality implementation and impact student achievement is lacking. It was lacking a rationale for why these schools and students were (or will be) selected and how the district believes that approach will set them up for success.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district does not include a high-quality plan in its application for scaling up the reforms proposed and implementing them district-wide. A high-quality plan would include clear milestones and goals, and the district does not provide that kind of plan when discussing how it will scale the programs proposed in the application.

- The applicant articulates that it will scale the school transformations by using the 7 schools transformed through this application as incubators. This statement alone is not sufficient without a more detailed explanation of what this means and how it would be replicated.
- The district's plan also states that "scaling reform will be facilitated through a robust professional development program." It is not clear what this means or what impact professional development will have on the district's ability to scale reform. It makes sense that all teachers need to be able to teach effectively in the new kind of personalized environment the district envisions, but this doesn't constitute a clear plan for scaling these particular initiatives.

The applicant does not sufficiently address its theory of change or describe in detail how this reform proposal will help it reach its goals.

- The district's HS2020 plan describes briefly a theory that students need vastly different skills today to be successful in college and beyond, and that the learning environment needs to focus on producing students who guide their own learning. This begins to hint at a theory of change, however the applicant does not make the connection between this logic and the proposals outlined in its plan (ie, why the school transformations, ILC and extended learning structures in particular will enable the district to meet its goals). There is again a disconnect between the HS2020 plan and what the district is proposing in this application.

Selection Criterion A3 scores low because the district does not provide a high-quality plan that includes clear action steps and milestones for scaling their plan, and they do not identify a clear framework for how the projects in this plan will help the district reach its goals.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There are some concerns about the ability of this vision to impact student learning and increase equity at the rates described in the district's goals.

- The district does not clearly articulate how it will ensure priority for students in low-performing subgroups.
- The three projects are primarily designed for all students, and do not include strong indicators that show how they will be able to accelerate the growth of students who are farthest behind faster.
- A significant portion of the programs take place outside of the regular school day, especially for students who aren't in a transformation school. It is unclear how the district will ensure student participation in and access to these resources.

Overall, the goals that the district has outlined have some inconsistencies and while some strike the right balance of ambitious but achievable, others don't.

- Summative Assessments: Proficiency: A majority of the goals included in the table beginning on page 22 strike the ambitious but achievable balance. They call for, on average, a 2 point increase in the percentage of students scoring proficient or above each year for the overall group, and a 3 point increase for subgroups. Overall, the district's proficiency goals will result in a 10-15 percent increase over the next five years, which seems ambitious but still possible. In addition, this rate of growth would be significant for the students in the district, especially for those that are farthest behind. However, some of the end goals go above 100% scoring proficient or above, which is clearly not feasible. See, for example, 6th grade reading. In addition, the district applies in most cases (with a few exceptions) a flat rate of growth for subgroups, without taking into account that some subgroups are significantly farther behind than others and need to progress at faster rates. Growth: The growth goals are difficult to understand. It is unclear if they're actually measuring what they intend to measure. They are described as the "change in percentage of students scoring proficient or above from one year to the next" but the numbers in the table on page 24 are in both negative percentages and positive percentages. Given all of the concerns and uncertainty described here, it is unclear what these goals are measuring and therefore difficult to assess whether they are ambitious and achievable.
- Decreasing Achievement Gaps: The gap closure goals that begin in the table on page 28 do not align with the achievement goals and are highly ambitious and likely unachievable. The goals are defined as "the percentage of

students in the identified subgroup who performed proficient or better in comparison to all students." Based on the achievement goals, gaps defined this way would close by five points over the five year period. But the gap closure goals show the gap closing by significantly more than that. For example, in 3rd grade reading the gap between all students and economically disadvantaged students would go from -16.9 percentage points to -1.9%. More information on the methodology would have been helpful here to determine if these goals are ambitious and achievable. In addition, there is concern that in some cases it appears a reverse gap is being created, meaning the subgroup outperforms the all students group by the 2016-17 school year, as represented by a positive gap.

- Grad Rate: These goals are ambitious and achievable, proposing a one percentage point increase per year. Given grad rates are already relatively high, a one percent increase seems ambitious.
- College Enrollment: These goals are ambitious and achievable, proposing a two percentage point increase yearly. However, it does not seem reasonable to set goals for subgroups that do not have baselines.

Overall, there is a bit of confusion about the methodology used to determine some of these goals, and there also appears to be misalignment between the various categories (achievement v. growth v. gap closure), making the goals unachievable as a whole. However, the district is awarded some points because the proficiency goals, graduation rate goals, and college enrollment goals are generally ambitious and feasible.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's track record of success is mixed based on the evidence that was submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the positive side, over the past four years, there are measures provided that indicate success in improving student outcomes, such as value-add scores that exceed expectations, a strong performance index (though it is unclear what this actually measures), meeting AYP, and a consistent "Excellence with Distinction" rating from the state (though again, it is unclear what is required to earn this rating). • However, the district does not provide raw student achievement data to support these other measures. It would have been helpful to see actual data to illustrate improvements in absolute achievement measures on state tests to substantiate these other data points. • Data is also limited demonstrating the closure of achievement gaps, graduation rate improvements, and college enrollment figures. The district describes some of the strategies it employs to close gaps (such as intervention programs) but gives limited data to show evidence of this. It shows gap closure results in its two lowest performing schools and only in third grade. This is not enough evidence to sufficiently demonstrate district-wide success in closing achievement gaps. In addition, the district includes a table to illustrate which subgroups in various grades and subjects are "moving toward proficiency" but this doesn't adequately capture what progress has been made over the past four years. • In its persistently lowest achieving schools (PLAs), the district describes using intervention programs, and extended learning time. However, this is not sufficient to be considered "ambitious and significant." While these strategies may be important strategies to close gaps, without addressing the quality of instruction or the leadership/human capital aspects of the school building, they will not alone lead to dramatic improvements. <p>The district demonstrates a track record of making student performance data available to relevant audiences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district has a Home Access Center (HAC) where parents and students can access non-academic information, and they send home the students' "data notebooks" so parents can follow the student's progress in the classroom. Students also use these notebooks to set goals and track their progress towards meeting them. • The one piece of information that is lacking for parents is information on formative and other interim assessments. • However, teachers have a strong tool at their disposal in the Performance Matters Instructional Improvement System, which gives them access to a variety of important academic data. <p>There are some strong elements in this section such as some of the data systems and tools used by teachers, and the general trends in high achievement overall in this district. However, the lack of information and data demonstrating gap closure, improved graduation rates, college enrollment rates, and the insufficient evidence showing dramatic reforms in PLAs lead this district to score in the medium range in this category.</p>		

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district demonstrates a high level of transparency in its processes, practices, and investments and makes a significant amount of relevant data public in the appropriate ways, with only a few pieces of information that are uncertain based on the description.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district states that "all school-level expenditures, including personnel salaries for all instructional and support staff, are compiled and posted on the ODE website." However, it is unclear whether these are individual salaries or aggregate salaries, and whether these salaries are separated out by staff type (teacher vs. support staff, for example). Non-personnel expenditures at the school-level are included in the district's "Popular Annual Financial Report." The district is in the process of developing a financial dashboard that will make viewing this information very easy for anyone who wants to view it. <p>Full points cannot be awarded because of the uncertainties around the way in which personnel salaries are displayed, but the district clearly demonstrates transparency in its practices and investments throughout this section, earning it a majority of points.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district successfully demonstrates sufficient autonomy to implement its proposal, however there is some risk involved which prohibits this district from earning full points in section B3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are three key pieces of legislation described in the proposal that are most important for enabling sufficient autonomy: HB1, SB311, and HB153. HB153 is most critical as it allows the district to operate schools under an "Innovation School" designation allowing it significant autonomy and waivers from collective bargaining provisions. However, in order to earn this designation, the district must show evidence that a majority of administrators and teachers assigned to the relevant school consent to seeking the designation, as well as a statement of support from other school staff, students, parents, and community members. This could pose significant challenge for the district without proper buy-in. <p>While the district seems to enjoy successful conditions and sufficient autonomy, the need for buy-in and public support for one of the most critical pieces of flexibility makes it too uncertain to earn full points.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is some evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement, but a few key pieces are missing that prohibit the applicant from scoring the full 10 points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district describes various processes it has undergone to seek engagement and feedback on other proposals. For example, the district describes significant stakeholder engagement in the development of the HS2020 proposal. In addition, they engaged community members in a 2011 study of the future housing needs of the student population. However, there is little evidence of direct engagement in the development of this particular proposal. The district does not demonstrate the requirements of teacher engagement for collective bargaining districts or non-collective bargaining districts, but it does demonstrate support from the teachers' union in the form of a letter of support. While this support is important, it does not demonstrate sufficient engagement of the teachers impacted by the proposal. <p>The district includes letters of support from a sufficient number and variety of stakeholders to meet the requirement of showing support from "key stakeholders" as required in B4(b).</p> <p>Overall, section B4 scores in the medium range since it has engaged in significant community engagement around some of the studies that informed this proposal, and it demonstrates letters of support from a variety of stakeholders. However, because it does not demonstrate parent or teacher engagement directly in the development of this proposal, it cannot be awarded full points.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district does not include a high-quality plan for analyzing its current status in implementing personalized learning environments. A high-quality plan would include clear action steps taken or to be taken to assess its current progress in implementation. There is no mention of</p>		

such a plan in the application.

The district does not explain the logic behind the reform proposal either, however it does briefly touch on the gaps that exist, stating that it will give priority to those students (though it does not explain how they will do so). In addition, the district lists gaps by subgroup and grade/subject area, but does not explain how its plan will impact these gaps nor does it differentiate its proposal based on the trends in data. For example, in looking at the change in gaps from 2011 to 2012, it is clear that IEP students face the largest gap, and ELL students' gaps widened in 6 out of 14 grades and subjects assessed. It would be helpful to see a rationale for how the plan will specifically address these particular gaps, in addition to addressing gaps overall.

Because the district does not demonstrate a majority of the information requested in this section (as described above), it scores low in this category, but receives some points for including a comparison of its gaps from one year to the next.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Overall, the plan described in C1 was not strong and was lacking important pieces of information requested in the selection criteria. The plan presented was inadequate to fully understand how the projects described would enable a comprehensive personalized learning environment.

C1(a): There is some, but limited, evidence to demonstrate how students will be responsible for their own learning.

- Other than the data notebooks described previously, there is no evidence to show that students will identify and pursue their own goals, and track their own progress. While the data notebooks are an important part of this process, the proposal lacks information on how this will carryover with and integrate into the work students do at the ILC (with the exception of the personal success network), which will be discussed below) and in NEXT extended learning experiences. It does not describe a coherent approach to students investment in and tracking of their learning.
- There is some evidence that students can engage in experiences that interest them academically, but the limitations of the school transformation experience being focused on STEM and the arts excludes some students' interest areas.
- There is evidence that students will be able to engage in experiences at the ILC and in NEXT extended learning that will develop their academic knowledge and personal skills, such as Model UN, as well as the many hands-on learning experiences available at the ILC.

C1(b): In terms of a strategy to implement varied and personalized instruction, evidence is mixed and not particularly compelling.

- While the idea of the ILC is strong, there is no evidence to demonstrate how a personalized learning environment will be created for students, and no evidence that this will be carried over into the school day. In addition, the quality of the students' experience at the ILC will be dependent on the staff in the building, and there was not sufficient evidence to give confidence that students will have enough guidance to have a meaningful experience connected to their learning during the school day.
- There is evidence, however, that students will have exposure to a variety of learning experiences through some of the technologies described for use at the ILC but it is not clear that students will know how to navigate this variety in a meaningful way to support their learning effectively.
- The proposal describes the four networks of the ILC but does not provide sufficient detail to explain how students will participate in the networks, or what the network structure means in practice. It is difficult to truly understand how these networks will be structured and what impact they will have. The Personal Success Network describes what should be happening broadly in the applicant's proposal, as it creates personalized learning plans for students and integrates a variety of learning mechanisms (online, small group, one-to-one) outside the normal classroom setting. However, it is only occurring in one part of the ILC and proposal overall.
- The district does not sufficiently describe how students will have access to ongoing feedback and data to inform learning. It is particularly unclear how data will be integrated across the wide variety of programs and supports proposed in this plan to create a cohesive picture. For example, if a student is taking online classes after school at the ILC, participating in an intervention program at the breakfast club, and sometimes working in a small group at the ILC, how will data and feedback be synthesized to capture a full picture of the students' needs and progress? How will these experiences relate to and inform their classroom experience?
- There is some evidence of personalized learning described in the school transformation proposal. For example, at the Elementary STEM school, students will learn in a multi-age environment where they will demonstrate mastery of integrated units before progressing to the next project-based experience instead of operating in traditional grade structures. However, it is difficult to get a full picture of what the learning experience would be like for students in each

school and what their typical school day would look like.

- Evidence is lacking to describe how these projects and initiatives would be adapted or able to meet the needs of high-need students. There is reference to having staff who specialize in ELL and SPED instruction in the ILC, and the district describes intervention programs that will occur during the breakfast club. In addition, there is mention throughout the application of giving priority to high-need students for participation. However, the details of what these accommodations would look like is lacking. In addition, there is concern that without transportation services, it will be difficult for some high-need students to attend before, and after school programming, as well as to utilize the ILC.

C1(c): Aside from the personnel who will staff the programs, there is no evidence of mechanisms to support student understanding of the various tools and resources, or how they fit into their personal learning process.

Overall, there is a lack of detail in the proposed plan and the three projects feel disconnected. There is an overall lack of cohesion in terms of creating a personalized learning environment, despite there being lots of different components of such an environment embedded across different projects. There is not enough evidence to substantiate that true personalized learning experiences will be provided during the school day to enhance and complement the programming that takes place outside the school day, especially for students who are not in a transformation school. This section scores medium-low because there are some components of personalized learning and student ownership of work that are scattered throughout the various projects, but the lack of cohesion causes it to lose significant points.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

3

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

C2(a): This selection criteria is focused on providing educators and principals with training and professional development that supports their ability to implement personalized learning environments by adapting content, measuring progress, meeting the needs of all students, and using evaluation systems to improve teacher and principal effectiveness by providing meaningful feedback. This proposal does not provide sufficient evidence for some of these criteria, and provides no evidence for others.

- The district outlines four different components of its "Growing Teachers and Leaders" proposal: a virtual PD portal, a summer training academy, an "Innovative Learning Environments Conference," and finally a partnership with higher education institutions to expand graduate and postgraduate course options for teachers. These components of the teachers and leaders plan are inadequate for providing the kind of support teachers will need to truly be effective instructors in a personalized learning context. None of these professional development experiences are job-embedded, nor are they sustained (both elements of high-quality PD). Conferences are not sustained PD and have limited impact for the expense typically, and graduate studies tend to bear no connection to teacher effectiveness. Teachers will need intense professional learning communities at their school sites and within the district, as well as significant observation and coaching in the classroom to be equipped to do what is described in this selection criteria. However, this proposal does not describe such an approach.
- There is also not sufficient evidence in the proposal as to how the applicant will use meaningful feedback from the teacher and principal evaluation system to improve educator effectiveness.

C2(b): There is little evidence that teachers will be equipped to know how to match the tools and resources provided to student needs in order to accelerate academic progress. The professional development described here does not appear to include adequate support in this regard. There is also no evidence to show how teachers will use data to determine the effectiveness of the resources provided in meeting student needs.

C2(c): There is not evidence in the proposal to demonstrate that school leaders will receive training that will enable them to structure an effective personalized learning environment. The proposal outlines a goal of having 100% highly effective principals by the end of the grant, but describes no significant professional development or supports for school leaders.

Overall, the proposal is lacking significant information around many of the key components of this selection criteria. There is hardly reference to a teacher or principal evaluation system (except that it will be implemented next year) and no effort to describe how the information from such a system will be used to support the development and capacity of teachers and principals to do this work. The professional development components that are described are not built into the school day structure or personalized for individual teachers and their needs, and will not be sufficient to support teachers in executing this type of instruction. As a result, this section of the proposal scores low.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		

The district has a lot of strong policies and practices in place to support a personalized learning environment:

- The organization of the central office includes several staff focused on instructional practice, and has individual people responsible for each component of the plan, which will help support implementation.
- As described in the application, the principal leads a "School Improvement Team," which, as a group will have authority to set schedules and calendars, determine personnel and staffing models, develop budgets, and more. This structure is important to creating enough flexibility for the school to implement the plan. In addition, data teams will monitor individual student data and report to the school improvement team on progress, which should help inform their strategic planning (including budgeting, staffing, etc.).
- Evidence is demonstrated that students can earn credits through a credit flexibility program and online courses based on mastery.
- There are a few mechanisms in place (for example, implementing 6-12 standards based report cards) that will give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery multiple times, but without information about how teachers will improve practice and how the instructional day will be structured, it is difficult to know if students will truly have the academic opportunity to demonstrate this mastery at multiple times. They can only do this if they have multiple opportunities to learn the information and whether or not that structure exists (especially in the non-transformation schools) is unclear.

However, it is unclear how resources and instructional practices will be adapted to meet the needs of all students (especially SPED and ELL).

- There is reference to staffing licensed SPED and ELL staff across all projects but it is unclear what role they will play or how they will interact with students in the context of their regular instructional experience.
- In addition, the proposal mentions that one component of PD for all teachers will be focused on strategies for teaching ELL and SPED students. However, this isn't mentioned anywhere else and does not seem to be a comprehensive plan for supporting educators with instructional strategies in this area. There is also no mention of how the various resources and technologies will be adapted to meet the needs of diverse learners. The evidence provided is not sufficient to earn points for this section.

Section D1 scores relatively high because it demonstrates that a significant amount of autonomy and flexibility is given to schools, which will allow them to implement the kinds of structures described, but it loses points because there is insufficient evidence to substantiate how the needs of all students will be met.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district has a fairly strong plan to support access to resources for all students, including those from low-income families:

- It will not charge fees for economically disadvantaged students in any program.
- It will offer a device loan program at the ILC so students can take technology items home.
- The transformation schools will be open-enrollment on a lottery basis.
- The one missing element that would make this plan stronger is around transportation for low-income students to and from before- and after-school programming, and the ILC.

The district has a strong technical support plan.

- There is a tech support hotline in place for families' and educators' use.
- They have a student-managed help desk at the ILC, which is a great way to engage student interests and develop their learning experiences.

The Home Access Center provides good access to data for parents and students. However, there is no academic data contained in this system other than course grades. It would be beneficial to parents to have access to formative assessment data and students' personalized learning plans with progress to goals. The Performance Matters System is a strong tool for teachers, but there is no evidence that the district and schools use inter operable data systems around HR, student information, budgets, etc.).

Overall, the district adequately addresses a majority of required components in D2, including establishing innovative programs to ensure access to resources, and technical support structures that serve dual purposes (providing technical support and enhancing student learning). However, the district loses points for not providing parents with easy access to student assessment data, and not identifying how data systems within the district and schools work together across a variety of functions. In this section, the district scores medium-high.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district describes several mechanisms it will use to review data on student progress, but does not provide sufficient evidence to describe the continuous improvement process it will put in place. The plan is lacking evidence as to how the district will use the data it is examining.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district describes five different data analysis teams: two of which will monitor student achievement data, three of which will track implementation progress. These structures represent a good foundation for being able to track the data points needed to implement a continuous improvement strategy, however, there is not a plan described for executing the continuous improvement process. The proposal references a "continuous improvement plan," but does not provide adequate documentation to explain what this is. It is also unclear how all five of these teams will integrate their findings to inform a cohesive approach. There is no evidence that a structure to support the synthesis of these teams is in place. <p>In this section, the district scores medium because it has strong mechanisms in place to track data, but needs further development for its plan of synthesizing and using that data to make continuous improvements.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district has many structures in place to have ongoing communication with stakeholders and progress and adjustments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> written reports from the School Improvement Team, Accountability Team, and District Data Team a webpage for public communication of progress to goals a community relations coordinator who will issue parent e-blasts an annual report that will be issued to the Superintendent, Board of Education, principals, parents, media, etc. <p>However, the district does not have a clear plan for engaging these stakeholders in providing feedback and guidance on their plan to inform future adjustments and revisions. The district is communicating information out to these stakeholders but does not have mechanisms to receive communication and guidance in return to improve its practices. It is for this reason that the district does not earn full points.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>For the most part, the state assessment goals from section A4 that are carried over into this section meet the bar of ambitious yet achievable. However, many of the other measures miss the mark on one or both of these requirement. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By next year, the district aims to have 100% of participating students with a highly effective principal. Particularly given that there isn't a baseline, it seems unachievable to set such a high target. Given that there are participating students in every school in the district, as described in section A, it seems unachievable to ensure that every school has a highly effective principal by next school year. The percent of students with an effective teacher, and the percent of students with a highly effective teacher total 100% by the 2013-14 school year, meaning no participating students will be taught by a teacher who is less than effective. While this is an ambitious and well-founded goal, it seems unachievable. It is unclear where these teachers will come from, and whether this goal will negatively impact non-participating students by increasing their rate of having ineffective teachers. If the estimated baseline for the ACT EXPLORE/PLAN assessments is close to accurate, it is unreasonable to set a target of 100% of all students and subgroup students on track to college & career readiness, especially for students on IEPs, for example, whose estimated baseline is 14%. That is a significant amount of progress to make on the ACT EXPLORE/PLAN assessments in five years and does not seem reasonable. In PreK-3, the DMA assessment goal has set ambitious targets (getting up to 99% at or above grade level) without having baselines. This is unrealistic. The Fountas & Pinnell assessment targets do not call for subgroup students who are farthest behind growing at faster 		

rates, which is not ambitious.

- Participation rates in the Breakfast Program proposed in this application show all students and students in underperforming subgroups participating at the same rate. It would be more ambitious to expect students in subgroups to participate at a higher rate since the district is prioritizing their participation.

The rationale provided for using each measure is not strong, nor does it detail how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information. For example:

- For six of the measures, the district provides its rationale as "An increase in this percentage will indicate an increase in college- and career-readiness and preparation." This does not provide sufficient information to indicate why this measure is chosen and what it will tell us about the effectiveness of the programs proposed in this plan.
- There are not specific measures for the transformation schools (except for the number of students taking STEM courses). It would be more ambitious to have students at these schools grow at faster rates than others and tracking this over the four years would be helpful.
- The district lists measures for the ILC and NEXT extended learning programs in another section, but they are all input based and are not listed as annual goals by subgroup. They will measure things like: participation in PD and satisfaction, ILC participation, NEXT participation, etc. None of these measures really get at the quality of the programs.

The proposal does not clearly describe how the applicant will review, and improve the measure over time. There is one reference to this in this section when the district says "inefficiency in data collection or the information provided will be addressed and corrected" but this does not sufficiently describe how the metrics will be reviewed over time. One can assume some of the accountability, data and implementation teams will be looking at whether these measures are the right measures and are yielding the information they want to course correct if necessary, but this is not explicitly stated.

Overall, the performance measures in this section score medium-low. While some are appropriate and meet the bar of "ambitious yet achievable," there is a good portion of them that raise some concerns, as described above. In addition, information is lacking as to the rationale for selecting these particular measures and it is not clear that they will yield valuable information about implementation progress. Finally, the plan for continuous improvement of these measures is insufficient. As a result, the district earns some points for having some strong measures, but loses points in the other sections.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district does not adequately describe a high-quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its activities, nor does it describe plans to more productively use time, staff, monthly or other resources to improve results. For example:

- The metrics outlined in this section are primarily input based and will not yield high-quality information to help the district assess effectiveness in order to better use resources. They are primarily focused around participation in projects.
- The district states that indicators will be "carefully monitored" and teams will be charged with "cross-referencing grant expenditures with achievement results" but information is lacking as to how the district will do this.
- However, the district demonstrates in other sections that it has several different team structures in place at the school and district level to evaluate both students achievement and implementation data, which is helpful. Having these mechanisms in place means that it will be easy to implement a high-quality plan for evaluating effectiveness.

Overall, section E4 scores medium-low. The district earns points for having comprehensive structures in place for data analysis, laying a good foundation. But, information was lacking about the cohesion between these teams, exactly what data they will look at and how often, and what the district would do with the information to improve implementation.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district's budget proposal is strong and provides sufficient detail and rationale for its investments. For example:

- The district's budget proposals clearly identify the amount of funds coming from this grant, and the amount needed from other sources.

- The budget numbers seem reasonable and sufficient to support the implementation of the plan. The budget narratives are specific and justify each expenditure clearly. For example, the district breaks down computer expenses into an exact number of devices and the cost per device. The numbers provided in these breakdowns appear reasonable and sufficient for the RTT-District funded portion.
- The district's rationale for using RTT-District funds on one-time expenses is sound and it is clear that the district has been strategic in thinking about how to allocate its resources. For example, it talks about using RTT-District funds for equipment, supplies, furniture, and salaries for startup positions. These are all one-time expenditures and smart uses of this one-time funding.

However, the district does not clearly identify where all of the \$79.5 million it will need in other resources to execute this work will come from. It identifies a few sources, for example \$550,000 coming from the district to support renovation and construction of the ILC, and an additional \$1.6 million for salaries at the schools. However, there is a significant amount of funding needed without specific sources identified, which is concerning in terms of successful execution and sustainability.

It is for this reason that the district does not earn full points in this section. However, the majority of components in its budget proposal are strong, scoring it high in this section.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

As mentioned in section F1, the district does not provide sufficient detail on the sources of funding for the additional \$79.5 million needed to execute this proposal during the four-year grant period, nor does it outline a high-quality plan for sustainability beyond that. For example:

- A high-quality plan would outline timelines, milestones, and funding sources for sustainability beyond the life of the grant. This proposal identifies some sources of funding that will complement the federal funds received through this proposal, but does not identify long-term sources of funding for sustainability in most cases.
- There is one instance where the district identifies program income from the NEXT summer experience program, stating that it will generate \$300,000 over the four years. This does not seem sufficient to sustain the program fully in the long-term.
- While the district demonstrates letters of support from local leaders and other partners, there is little evidence regarding financial commitment from these sources to sustain the work beyond the grant.

This section scores medium-low as it does not include a detailed plan for the transition to state and local funds after the grant period. It is unclear what the ongoing costs will be or where the funding will come from.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1) In this section, the district describes a coherent partnership with a variety of organizations, including institutions of higher education, counseling services, and organizations too provide enrichment activities such as ballet and theater. This extensive network of partners all have a clear role in supporting the plan described in the application. However, most of these partnerships are funded through the grant proposal as indicated in the budget tables, and evidence is lacking to demonstrate the sustainability of these partnerships.

2) The district identifies the population-level desired results for these partnerships but they are not high-quality because many of them are difficult to measure. For example, one of the desired results is that "students will develop greater interest in appreciation for STEM and the arts," and another states that "the social and emotional well being of students and their families will improve." While these are appropriate desired-results for the partnerships described, they will prove to be very difficult to measure. There are also no baselines or targets identified in section 6 of this criterion to help clarify what these desired results are and how the district will know if they've been met.

3) The district explains that it will match data from the performance measures outlined in this section and E3 to students participating in these particular partnerships. This is a strong idea in terms of tracking achievement data back to these programs to determine if there is added value for students who participate in one of these partnerships, as well as to measure teacher effectiveness data for the teachers who take courses through the university partnerships. However, the district does not outline a clear plan for using this data to target resources appropriately, and it does not include a strategy for scaling the model or improving results over time. In addition, it is unclear how these measures will be assessed and therefore, appear difficult to track back to specific partnerships.

4) The district's proposal adequately describes how these partnerships would integrate education and other services. For example, the

partnership with Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Ohio will provide school-based mentoring programs to support the social and emotional components of a students learning experience within the school-day.

5) The district does not provide information to address the components in section 5 of this Competitive Preference criterion. It states that "district staff will be intricately involved in every identified partnership. This partnership...will equip staff with the necessary tools to ensure students and their families are being partnered with the best available resources." This is not sufficient information to assess how the partnerships would build staff capacity to asses the needs of students and evaluate resources in meeting those needs. It also does not describe how parents will be involved in assessing the value of resources against student needs.

6) In terms of annual ambitious and achievable targets for the population-level results, in this case the district uses the same outcomes listed in E3, and does not set annual targets for the population-level results directly related to these partnerships that are outlined in this section.

Overall, the Competitive Preference priority scores medium-low for this district. While they have some strong partnerships identified that are addressing various components of their plan, there is little evidence that there is a strong plan in place to assess effectiveness and ensure that these partnerships are meeting student needs. In addition, the population-level results desired are not specific and do not seem easily measurable.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Overall, the district's proposal meets the absolute priority of addressing personalized learning environments.

- Through it's Instructional Learning Center, the district plans to offer varied high-quality learning experiences for students that will allow them the opportunity to engage in instruction (either online or through experiential learning) that meets them where they are in their individual educational paths. Through this Center effective teachers will have technology that can expand their reach to more students, and students in subgroups with historically large gaps will have priority for participation.
- The school transformations will focus on recruiting effective educators for all students, changing the structure of the school experience to allow students to master content in many ways and progress at their own pace, and provide opportunities for students to engage in their interest areas.
- The NEXT extended learning programs (breakfast, after-school, and summer) will provide unique and varied opportunities for students to access material through robotics programs, for example, and will aim to appeal to their specific academic interests. The breakfast program will target students who are behind and provide intervention supports.

The projects proposed in this plan will effectively build on the state's work in the four assurance areas by implementing common core state standards, using data teams at various levels to analyze data, providing professional development to educators, and giving priority to high need students.

As described in the comments throughout this application, the plan lacks the level of detail needed to give confidence that this proposal will yield the desired outcomes, but overall, the proposal addresses the absolute priority.

Total	210	98
-------	-----	----

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form



Application #0399OH-2 for Hilliard City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Hilliard City School District (HCSD) is to be commended for beginning to design a vision and plan in 2006 and then with the HS2020 report and later the middle and elementary schools. HCSD reports that they are committed to: 1) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; 2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction; 3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and 4) turning around lowest-achieving schools. It was still not totally clear how each of the nine elementary/middle along with the 10 high school steering committee findings actually aligns with one another and then with the four core educational assurance areas as a district.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Students from all HCSD elementary schools (14 total), middle schools (3 total), and high schools (3 total) will participate in the project. A total of four elementary schools, three middle schools, and one Innovative learning Center will support the applicants grant programming. A final building selection though will be based on student performance data and location of the building based in the district to enhance accessibility. All of the middle schools will be transformed to house schools-within-schools and is in alignment with the district's recent work to create learning pathways. Priority for participation will be given to student subgroups in which the performance achievement gaps have historically been the highest across the district and these are the economically disadvantaged, students with individualized education plans (IEP), and limited English proficient students (LEP). Schools and programs proposed to be involved will total 440 students with a minimum of 40% being from low income families.</p> <p>Moderate Evidence is provided regarding the applicants approach to implementation high quality reforms. A description of the process to choose the schools is provided with one criteria being student performance and the other being building location. Priority was also reported to be those subgroups that have historically been the highest across the district regarding achievement gaps. While a process is provided for selection of the sites and it appears the activities align with the district's plan, there was no evidence in the plan as to the weighting of the choice of site selection between student performance or district building physical location.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>HCSD's plan for scaling the program and grant activities into the future include elementary innovation schools as incubators around learning and teaching, schools within schools at the middle level, and new programs and strategies through the 2013 learning center. Plans for scaling future innovations include: 1) using elementary innovation schools as incubators for innovative learning and teaching strategies; 2) schools-within-schools at the middle school level will serve the same incubation role; and 3) new programs and instructional strategies implemented in the ILC will be replicated in all district schools in future years.</p> <p>Weak Evidence is provided regarding a plan to scale-up and translate meaningful reform. Evidence in the plan to translate and scale-up meaningful reform was not clearly articulated to include who would be the responsible party. It was also not evident to how the plan and vision could be revised based upon experience and lessons learned over the project timeframe. It was also not evident as stated in the action steps how refinement and review in the final year of the project would be done to determine continuation and improvement would impact sustainability and scalability prior to the end of the plan.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strong Evidence of "ambitious" and "achievable" improved outcomes was evident. Notable were the "ambitious" goals that included high school graduation at a rate of 100% for Native Americans. Also noteworthy was that outcomes for College Enrollments would be equally distributed across all groups culminating at 94%. For this reviewer, it was felt and shared in the application that HCSD established "Achievable" goals that aligned and were informed by prior success. More specifically, HCSD's successes of being recognized for the last five years by the state as - Excellent with Distinction while at the same time HCSD's Performance Index Score (designed to measure the level of achievement test performance) increased from 101.1 to 104.4, essentially a 3.25% increase in students achieving proficiency on the state assessment. Based on this past performance, this reviewer recognizes the goal setting which is ambitious (above prior gains), but that is also achievable given the incremental goals of approximately 5% - 15% over the grant period for students meeting proficiency. Evidence of equitable goal setting was also provided as noted by the College Enrollment rates for all subgroups being equal. Weak Evidence was noted regarding the support for why there were varied sub group decreases in achievement gaps and how they were derived.</p>		

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strong Evidence of HCSD's success over the past four years was provided in their receipt of recognition over each of the last five years by the state as - Excellent with Distinction. Over this same time period the district Performance Index Score (designed to measure the level of achievement test performance) has increased from 101.1 to 104.4 which is essentially a 3.25% increase in students achieving proficiency on the state assessment. More specifically, the District has met 26 out of 26 required State performance indicators and satisfied the State's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) subgroup performance targets by using the academic growth projection. Gaps have been addressed the most in Economically Disadvantaged subgroup numbers increasing the most of the subgroups, rising from 16.4% in 2008 to 22.5% - a 37% increase over five years. It is also noted by HCSD that the data has demonstrated growth above Value-Added minimum standards consistently for the last five years. Strong evidence was also provided that the districts ambitious reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools demonstrate students are responding positively to intervention strategies. Cited were the interventions to the two schools that included 1) math and reading extension courses in grades 6-8; 2) READ180 in grades 6-9 for struggling readers; 3) Algebra I Workshop for struggling math students; 4) kindergarten literacy intervention programs; and 5) designated intervention teachers at the elementary level; and 7) before and after school intervention services. In addition, professional development was also offered to educational personnel. Strong Evidence was also noted that HCSD posts and shares data for stakeholders. In addition, educational forums and opportunities for parents are also provided. Also evident was how the data is being used to inform the summer freshman transition programs. For the elementary schools they are engaging students through the use of Data Notebooks for goal setting and collecting data about progress toward their goals. Electronic Home Access Center for parents and students to access data related to the student's career planning, schedule, attendance, interim reports, school fees, and incidents of discipline. The district also writes regular blog posts, and hosts community conversations about curriculum issues and student learning opportunities that are easily accessible for parents and students. Regular and sequential professional development sessions are provided throughout the school year for teachers and administrators about the effective and efficient ways to interpret and use student data points. Through the new Performance Matters site teachers and leaders now have access to data that includes college- and career readiness assessment results, common formative assessment results, and other pertinent student academic achievement.</p> <p>Not evident in the plan was what role the parents are participating in parent literacy and summer school sessions regarding using or accessing data to inform participation, instruction, and services. Parent gatherings appear to be targeted to economically disadvantaged and English language learner families. Not evident was the use of any alternative forms of communications and materials for families to enhance accessibility to families with limited English or reading skills. It was noted that 70% of the districts' student population is accessing the website, but it was unclear what they were actually accessing and who was not accessing it.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Moderate Evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments. Evidence was shared that the applicant was one of only two school districts in the state of Ohio to prepare an Association of School Business Officials award-winning meritorious budget document. This means that the budget provides all school-level expenditures, including personnel salaries for all school-level</p>		

instructional and support staff, and are compiled and posted on the Ohio Department of Education's website. It was also noted that HCSD is in the final stages of developing and launching a financial dashboard to be placed on the homepage of the district's website. This site will provide access to financial information, such as per pupil expenditure, property valuation rates, income and expenses by line item, and other financial drivers for the district. Financial information will continue to be easily accessible for review by district personnel, parents, business partners, and the general public. Not Evident in the applicant's response or materials shared was whether "(a) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff" is made available or if income and expenses are by line item.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

3

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Weak Evidence is provided supporting HCSD's sufficient conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments described. Evidence of an LEA Transformation Team that includes 50 percent teachers and 50 percent administrators and also includes twelve educators representative of all levels of the district: elementary, middle, high school, and central office. It was shared that the Transformation Team implements reforms related to the RttT program, identifies and shares best practices with other LEAs, provides monthly communications to participating schools and/or State personnel regarding progress, and submits progress and budget reports to ODE. It was also shared that this team had been intricately involved in planning the strategies outlined in this RttT funding application. While evidence of an LEA Transformation Team is provided and the applicant shares that they are a part of the state Race Top The Top activities it was not evident of how all of these teams and programs relate and support sufficient autonomy to do implementation of these enclosed activities. Additionally several key pieces of legislation were shared and the applicant highlighted how they relate, but it was unclear how state legislation and the State Board Of Education in the state all relate to this district regarding state legal and statutory guidance.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strong Evidence was conveyed for meaningful stakeholder engagement and support in the development of the proposal. HCSD has done work gathering teams and people to explore even student housing configurations of the schools. Key to these gatherings was the inclusion of community members who both did and didn't have children. Based on letters of support from parent leadership groups they felt they had an active role in the process to have their voices heard. Notable was also the recommendation from the group regarding the offering of foreign language opportunities. HCSD provided evidence of support from the bargaining unit for teachers (Hilliard Education Association), the HCSD Board of Education, the Hilliard Education Foundation, and the district association of parent-led organizations (InterSchool PTO). Letters of support from all of these critical partners were included in the appendix. Noteworthy also was the Superintendent's Student Advisory Committee which is comprised of students in grades 9-12 from all three high schools. Not Evident was elementary and middle school students/stakeholder engagement and support in the proposal.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Weak Evidence is provided by the applicant regarding a high-quality plan for an analysis of needs and gaps. Based on the performance data definitive gaps in achievement are evidenced in students that includes: Economically Disadvantaged (22.5% of total population); LEP/ELL - English Language Learners (6.5% of total student population); and IEP - Special Education Students (12% of total population). No Evidence was provided regarding the rationale, logic, activities, plan, personnel involved of how these groups were chosen. No evidence in the plan includes key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, or the parties responsible for implementing the activities.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Moderate Evidence was provided of a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The applicant will address personalized learning in three ways- Innovative Learning Center and four networks serving as a hub of innovation across the district. Staff directing this K-12 student union are reported to be staff that are highly trained and qualified Learning Coaches (LC). The development of networks that</p>		

encompass grade 5- 12 with programming for college and career readiness is a positive asset and addition. Provided for this learning center approach action steps, timeline, short and long term goals, and measures were evident. Second was a School Transformation of eight existing schools to address and support RTI, STEM, Arts and a multitude of other programming will be made available including moving towards measures of learning beyond seat-time. A program manager would be hired to facilitate and the plan included timeline, action steps, measures, outcomes, and linkages to performance measures. Third was Extended learning opportunities will take place and be implemented to offer enrichment, intervention, and exploration for all students through a vendor to be announced. They will also offer credit retrieval and recovery programming for students. During NEXT summer experience they will be offerings online coursework (for remediation, acceleration, and credit recovery), college coursework, special interest clubs/courses, and college readiness seminars. Evidence in the high quality plan was not located regarding how the Learning Coaches and the role they will assume in supporting personalized learning. Also not evident in the plan was how the Innovative Learning Center experiences by teachers and students would translate back into the school and classroom and be shared with parents for further support and actionable implementation and support.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

9

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Moderate Evidence of a high quality plan to provide an approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student was provided. Evidence was noted that HCSD's plan includes that all participating educators will engage in training, professional data teams, and professional teaching/learning communities that support effective implementation of personalized learning environments. This would be done by providing all staff greater access to professional development programming through on demand any time of the day, during the summer months, and throughout the school year via a Growing Teachers and Leaders project. Through Knowledge Builders program and partnerships with local colleges and universities will be established teachers and leaders can participate in accelerated graduate and post-graduate programs in curriculum and instruction, core content areas, and educational leadership. Evidence was provided of goals, activities, timeline, and deliverables. A concern to the high quality plan was that No Evidence was provided of who or how the decision of what persons will be chose or recommended to access these resources. It was not evident if it was going to be based on choice or embedded in district-wide professional development time and be required or some other type of offering. Evidence was also not observed regarding how these offerings would be tailored and personalized to the teachers or leadership guiding them to personalized professional development. The teaching and leading plan included six priority professional development topics, but it was not evident of a linking this to the teacher & principal evaluation systems.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Moderate Evidence was provided regarding the applicants high quality plan regarding practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning. Evidence was provided in the organizational chart that the system has a proposed governance structure of leadership to support this work. Each of the schools will be led by a school improvement team with the principal a part. The school improvement teams will work closely with the District Accountability Team and District Data Team in making short- and long-term decisions for the entire system. However, it is noted that the school improvement team will have the flexibility and autonomy to develop appropriate action steps to fully and effectively implement the scope of work in the application. Evidence was provided that the applicant is already offering student's opportunities to receive credit for competency based activities via the online courses. Course and credit retrieval are currently the two viable options mentioned giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and ways. Week Evidence was provided supporting a high quality plan regarding how the Director of Professional Development is aligned, selects, and targets the professional development for staff and leadership in the project. Not evident in the organizational chart or in the narrative was a role that the Professional Development Department would be taking in doing this work beyond just coordinating with the Director of Innovation and Extended Learning. Also not evident in the high quality plan was how the Director of Professional Development will relate to the Innovative Learning Center which will be a major part of ongoing professional development. Credibility concerns were not fully addressed in this high quality plan that arise when the three positions essential to the applicant's activities are noted on Page 84 will be created upon funding and are considered temporary. It was not evident how these activities and work would be maintained and scaled by district funded practices, policies, and rules.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Weak Evidence was presented that the LEA and school had a high quality plan that supports personalized learning. Evidence was</p>		

noted of the availability of technologies and supporting materials through the Innovative Learning Center. It will have an open access policy to technology and resources (including computers, tablets, and other instructional tools). The scope of work also includes the development of a device lease/loan program to make technology resources available in the homes of participating students. The center will also be open before, during, and after school allowing students access to the resources on their own time and schedules. Weak Evidence was provided in the plan regarding who supports content and users during the off hours other than the innovative learning center that would house the student support help desk. Weak Evidence was provided in this section regarding key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan given the size and scope of the project across the district.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: Strong Evidence was provided by the applicant for a strategy to implement a continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements. Evidence was provided regarding the structured teams, monitoring roles, responsibilities to the plan, and that the District Team would be by serving as the primary conduit of information and sharing to the public. Meetings of this team would occur quarterly and they would be the key stakeholder to overseeing the overall plan. No Evidence was evident of the actual make-up and selection of these teams and how they would be configured to provide support and sharing across them. It was also not evident of how district personnel relate or interact with these teams.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Strong Evidence was provided by the applicant regarding strategies for ongoing communication and engagement. Evidence of this communication and engagement plan includes the use of a website, in person contacts, regular meetings of varied teams, and quarterly updates by the Superintendent to the Board of Education. Synthesis of the information will come through the Executive Director of Curriculum & Instruction and the district's full-time community relations coordinator will use stories of student success and achievement as content on the district's website, for media releases to the community, and e-blasts to parents. An annual progress report will be developed by the Executive Director of Curriculum & Instruction and made available to the Superintendent, Board of Education, principals, bargaining unit members, parents, local media outlets, and the community at large. Mentioned in a prior section was that District team will develop effective two-way communication methods with internal and external stakeholders, including the local Board of Education, community at-large, business partners, and teachers' union. The team will be transparent in sharing evidence of progress toward the RttT scope of work, including data on selected indicators and use of resources.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: Moderate Evidence was provided by the applicant regarding ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets. Evidence was presented by the applicant of 17 performance measures across varied grade levels. Evidence was also noted in the table of the rationale, measure, and at the end the District Data Team's role to continuously reviewing the data collected to assure inefficiencies would be addressed and corrected. Evidence in the table presented also was specific to the targeted subgroups and included goals. Evidence was provided regarding ambitious goals of 100% of students being college and career ready with 100% completing FAFSA applications. Weak Evidence was provided supporting the ambitious, but possibly not achievable goal of increasing college readiness in some groups like students in LEP grade 9-12 moving from 9.2% baseline to 100% post grant. Evidence was also not provided regarding how a FAFSA completion rate goal of 100% for a family choice measure could be achieved.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: Moderate Evidence was provided by the applicant to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities. Evidence was shared that effectiveness will reside with Instructional Data, School Data, Accountability, District Data, and District RttT Transformation Teams that will be charged with cross-checking expenditures with student achievement results. Evidence was also provided that data points would be collected and monitored on a quarterly basis. Evidence was also presented of what data and disaggregated by		

subgroup would be reviewed for the varied activities in the project. Weak Evidence was reported in the plan of how often the other non-District RttT Transformation teams would meet to review data to make more real-time data informed changes to the project and how the evaluation would incorporate and feed this back to the project.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Moderate Evidence was provided by the applicant to support the budget and sustainability of the proposed project. Evident was the identification of funds and where the funding would be allocated. Greater details of the budget supporting reasonable and sufficient support for the work appear in Budget SubPart 4 providing detailed information of stipends, coursework, and additional fees broken out in order to support and related to the work. Weak Evidence was provided regarding the identification of some related to funds in the application relating to the project. More specifically this was how current and over time the state level Race To The Top funding mentioned impacts the applicants project. No Evidence was provided regarding the rationale in this section of the investment of priorities.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Weak Evidence was provided by the applicant of a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. Evidence was noted regarding annual commitments to fund the program and it appears that systems are in place that could start sustainability conversations. All four of the areas are addressed with allocations established for them. District and local Educational Service Center have committed \$65,000 annually to the Growing Teachers and Leaders Program. The five year budget displays the expenses and contract obligations and evidence of documentation regarding state and foundation funding were not noted. No Evidence speaks and is supportive though of the high quality plan that would include key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and this significantly weakens the overall credibility of the plan.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Moderate Evidence was provided in the competitive preferences priority regarding results, resource alignment, and integrated services. Evidence of an array listed out of partnerships and letters of support identifying their particular contribution and related activities of each university and other partner were shared. Post-secondary partnership with Ohio State University, Old Dominion University, Miami University, Columbus State Community College and Kenyon College are all notable partners with defined roles in the project. Social service providers, mentorship, afterschool, business, community, and Integrated Student Services providers are all listed and defined in their roles and contributions to the project. Evidence was also provided regarding the 7 population groups along with type and desired effects. Notable also is the desired result of parents being more engaged in the educational experience of their children. Evident also was the use of the full-time district assessment specialist who will disaggregate the data and share it with the District and its partners to assess the success of the partnerships, programs and resources. Less Evident was specifically what measures had already been chosen to track educational and family and community outcomes and how those were determined and by who and whether there was or would be any identification or inventory of the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not	Met

	Met	
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments was MET by the applicant. The entirety of the 2020 research process has resulted in a commitment by HCSD to focus on the four core assurance areas identified in RttT. HCSD is committed to: 1) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; 2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction; 3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and 4) turning around lowest-achieving schools. HCSD in the application has provided ample evidence of a focus on personalized learning environments through student generated Interests, assessments, and abilities that will define the curriculum, instruction, and assessments to be tailored for the student. The district and school environment is also being established to support these personalized learning experiences.</p>		

Total	210	125
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0399OH-3 for Hilliard City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The vision presented by Hilliard City School District (HCSD), presents a plan to focus on the elementary and middle school grades, taking from what has already been learned in prior work at the high school levels, and to specifically focus on developing a personalized plan for each student. Found lacking are the steps that will be taken to get to this point for each of the academic strands, elementary and middle levels. HCSD failed to identify the actual total numbers of elementary and middle schools to be a part of this vision plan.</p> <p>HCSD demonstrates a <u>certain</u> level of commitment to the four assurance areas. HCSD has adopted new standards and assessments that will help guide students towards college preparation, and has built a data system that helps measure student growth and success. This information helps to inform teachers of areas that need improvement. What remain unclear are the steps to be taken in this correction process, reflecting the involvement of student, parent, teacher, and key school leaders.</p> <p>Partnerships with Kenyon College, Ohio Dominican University, Sinclair Community College, and Columbus State Community College acknowledge the strong academic leadership efforts, and their commitment to work together helping students advance towards closing the gap.</p> <p>Based on the demonstration of evidence provided, the applicant receives a medium score for this criterion.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The challenge presented for schools need to align to the 21st century skills with the core curriculum is commendable, yet at the same time the specifics of activities is found lacking. In other words what planning activities will be put into place to address the alignment with the core curriculum?</p> <p>HCSD indicates that they have begun to implement new, and strengthen existing student-centric teaching and learning practices based on the 2020 research findings, yet the findings are not presented.</p>		

Through a partnership with Tolles Technical and Career Center there seems to be a plan to be implement a pre-engineering program, an intensive teacher academy and an entrepreneurship academy. Although the applicant failed to give the details of what each of these program will look like.

With the evidence provided a medium score is awarded for this criterion.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

2

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Scale up plan includes elementary and middle schools that will reflect innovative teaching and learning strategies. The plan reflects new programs and instructional strategies in the ILC unit. There is failure to outline what those specific strategies are, neither does it fully address the evaluation part reflected in the key goals and activities.

There is a plan across the district that reflects a robust professional development program, with additional refinement and implementation from recommended findings of both the 2020 Project and Student Housing committee. This model is projected to be replicated in all district schools beyond this grant-funding period. It remains vague as to how this will occur. This section is rated as low. There is insufficient information supplied with the necessary details to conceptualize the larger picture.

Based on the demonstration of evidence provided, the applicant receives a low score for this criterion.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The information provided reflects an ambitious yet non-attainable growth throughout the term of the grant. Graduation projections amongst the various student populations reflect an ambitious growth but do not reflect attainability. This can happen given a longer length of time beyond the funding cycle of this grant. The performance on summative assessments demonstrates efforts in lowering the achievement gap, with a steady graduation and college enrollment increase, this too will happen over a longer period of time.

What is lacking is a detailed explanation to accompany the charts, which have projected figures and timeframes. This would assist the reader in understanding better from the applicant's point of view. Lack of explanation leaves the interpretation to the reader. This section receives a low score for lack of clarity.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Evidence of data demonstrating a record of success over the past five years is supported by the letters of support and the awarding of the Excellence with Distinction from the state of Ohio which supported the efforts of the advancements made in student learning.</p> <p>Discussion in the use of a variety of research based intervention strategies help to address what is being used to cause these positive changes, which are showing up as valid results for classroom teachers. There is evidence of the availability of student performance data which is made easily accessible to students, teachers and parents in ways that help inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.</p> <p>The response provided in this section is supported with evidence in the appendix of the proposal as well as through graphic demonstration. This section merits a high rating.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates a commitment to transparency, as evidenced by the publications of Comprehensive Financial Report and the Popular Annual Financial Report. The applicant also states that they post their school-level expenditures on the Ohio Department of</p>		

Education' website making it available for the public, thus demonstrating an openness to their records.

In addition to having already demonstrated evidence of a high level of transparency, the applicant further demonstrates a strong commitment through the development of a financial dashboard, showcasing general information for district personnel, parents, business partners and the general public to view. What is not found is the training, which will be needed by the student, parent, and teacher.

Based on the information reported this section falls within the medium range.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicants plan to increase high school graduation rates; reduce the graduation gap; reduce the academic performance gap on national and statewide assessments; reduce the gap between Ohio and the nation's best-performing States on national reading and mathematics assessments, and doubling college enrollment. Additional evidence of a LEA Transformation Team consisting of teachers and administrators from all levels is in place and functioning. Although it is commendable to have as a goal to carry out all of the above, the plan is not realistic as stated.

Projected plans are to reduce the gap between Ohio and the nation's best-performing States on national reading and mathematics assessments is a statement beyond their immediate control. It appears that control can be maintained for one's own school but to state that the aim is to reduce that gap for the state of Ohio is seen as beyond their control, therefore places this as a weakness in their overall plan.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There is evidence of support by key stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal. A well-rounded team of a community-wide committee reflecting teachers, administrators, Board of Education members, business representation, and community members all seeking to determine how to improve current instruction to ensure student success in the immediate future and beyond. This team meet to discuss achievable goals based on information gathered from surveys, and data on student learning so as to develop a good strategy as they moved forward.

There is evidence of letters of support reflecting a strong cultivation of partnerships formed, namely, the Hilliard Education Association; Hilliard Education Foundation; HCSD Board of Education; and the Inter School PTO. Based on this section it is found to be a medium score.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The analysis provided of the district performance data via the charts helps to show needs and gaps that will need to be addressed. The plan calls for the achievement of the district's highest need students the Economically Disadvantaged, LEP/ELL-English Language Learners, and the IEP Special Education students. Specific details of what is proposed to take place needs to be identified.

The key components listed are all worthwhile areas to be served. The detailed activities that will be carried out was found lacking. This section is found to be weak.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>There is evidence of a strategy in place to conduct professional development that will help teachers to improve instruction and increase capacity to support student progress towards meeting college- and career-ready standards. The applicant also acknowledges the need to be flexible during the implementation period when adjustments and revisions are taking place.</p> <p>The district also realizes the need to conduct on going monitoring and public sharing of information, keeping all parties well informed. What is not clear is what assurances are there, to know that this is taking place. The person responsible to oversee these strands has not been identified. Based on the professional development and the need for monitoring evidence, the applicant is awarded a medium score.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	7
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It is the goals of the district to improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. Instructional strategies for all participating students will enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study that is aligned to college- and career-ready standards, as well as to college- and career-ready graduation, thus accelerating his or her learning through support of his or her needs.</p> <p>In their plan HCSD will train and support their students as they are exposed to variety new tools, which will allow them to become independent learners. What is not mentioned, are details of what the components of the training that will lead to that student independent learning, this process remains unclear.</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates their need to continually reflect and improve on their goals to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers. A full-time professional development director will be in place to ensure programs are sequentially planned and delivered. Participating educators will all be engaged in training taking steps to improve as a school culture. Although goals are stated it remains unclear as to what that training will look like or who exactly are the school leaders. The ties to colleges or universities are not clearly stated, placing this section of the evaluation in the medium range.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes to maintain a central office support team which is currently in place and prepared to ensure the quality implementation of the scope of work outlined in the proposal. Clarity as to who exactly are the central support is not well defined. The plan states of having the Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction form a team of directors, coordinators and instructional leaders at all three levels. The work developed and implemented by these teams will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aim to maintain and scale up permanent district-funded positions plus the infrastructure of the school leadership team will be led by the building principal • hold the flexibility and autonomy to make and carry out the various tasks. • place a robust credit flexibility program which will allow students to earn credit based on demonstration of mastery, a program implemented in 2010-2011 school year. Details of how this will be carried out remains ambiguous <p>The district has plans to re-design the progress reports currently used in grades 6-12 to become standard-based, and a commitment to risk-free assessments allowing students to retake assessments as learning improves, demonstrating mastery of standards. Clarification is needed on the number of times an assessment can be re-taken and what activities are in place in between these assessments, as well as who oversees all of this area of support.</p> <p>Based on the evidence and discussion provided in this section, it is found to fall within the medium range.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Evidence of components of four projects outlined in the scope of work is said to be fully available to all participating students. Additionally, necessary resources are also available to participating students and their parents.</p> <p>The applicant assures that technical support is made available to students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders to ensure successful implementation of the work of scope proposed.</p> <p>The applicant states that tools are in place within the district that allow parents and students to view and export their individual learning progress in an open data format. What is not clear is the assistance provided to parents as they learn how to use these tools.</p> <p>In addition to the tools, which students and parents have, access to HCSD uses an interoperable data system that includes human resource data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement. Discussion of how this interoperable data system will benefit all key stakeholders was not clarified.</p> <p>Based on this information this section is rated in the medium range.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Acknowledgement by the applicant of the need to be flexible in the needed adjustments and revisions during the time when implementation is taking place. It is evident that the applicant has a continuous plan in mind to improve delivery throughout the life of the grant.</p> <p>There is evidence of a strategy in place with continuous professional development that helps teachers to improve their instruction and increase capacity to support student progress towards meeting college-and career-ready standards. On-going monitoring and public sharing of information is key the design keeping all parties well informed. What is not indicated is what assurance are there to know that this is taking place. Who will oversee this strand?</p> <p>Work plan also reflects the supporting of an effective personalized environment which helps students graduate and are college-career-ready, yet specific details are lacking which will measure the effective piece. The district has as a goal that an on-going change and modification to students personalized plans will take place resulting in accelerating student progress. Evidence and discussion provided places this section in the medium range.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant reflects an on-going professional development plan for participating educators to access and learn how to use tools, data and additional resources which help to further student progress, and identify optimal learning approaches meeting students academic needs and interests. The project plan reflects going communication by holding weekly meetings of the School Improvement Teams, Accountability Team, and District Data Team.</p> <p>Lacking is the discussion of this plan is the process of how to utilize this information to make appropriate adjustments causing change. With evidence supplied this portion is found to rank between medium to a high range.</p> <p>.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has identified a total of thirteen ambitious yet achievable performance measures, with three of these measures falling within the social/emotional areas. The rationale for selecting these measures;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will be to focus on the increase in number and percentage of a highly effective teacher which will impact the overall achieving goal as set by the district The use of the Ohio achievement assessment and the Ohio graduation test beginning in grades 3-10 will provide valuable information about student academic achievement and growth. This will provide the on-going measures needed from an early stage to ensure that student achievement and growth is a continuous process. Developmental math and literacy assessments will provide the achievement/growth information for all participating students <p>An established District Team will be charged with overseeing that data is being collected on all thirteen-performance measures to be able to examine the rigor involved, making necessary adjustments that will lead to the applicant's success in the over-all student achievement rates.</p> <p>The details of how this information will be utilized and shared amongst key players were not clearly addressed therefore finding this section in the medium range.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant emphasizes in their quality plan the need to increase the number of students to receive their instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. It lacks clarity of how the evaluation will be carried out to measure the effectiveness of educators involved.</p> <p>An evaluation measure has been provided in the appendix, yet mention is made that a measure is to be developed, therefore finding</p>		

contradiction in the plan. This section is rated in the medium range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's budget identifies all funds sought to support the project. An overview of the grant funding request breakdown in each of four areas presented in the proposal are clearly presented.</p> <p>The cost of the total work scope includes grant dollars and outside funding sources provide a total amount figure reflecting a reasonable and sufficient plan to support the development and implementation of this proposal based on the number of students to receive service, and the amounts to cover the innovative center, the extended learning programs, the project growing teachers and leaders, and the school transformation project.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget plan reflects commitments from the Hilliard City Schools' Board, HCSD, and grant monies all supporting the sustainability efforts well beyond the four-year RttT funding cycle.</p> <p>In addition HCSD has developed many partnerships with public and private organizations, which was designed to augment the district's human and financial resources.</p> <p>What has not been addressed is the clarity of buy-in being proposed of the private sector. This section is found to fall within the medium range.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has clearly addressed with a description of the sustainable partners formed with private and public organizations, thus meeting the Absolute Priority 1. The Competitive Preference Priority: Population-Level Desired Results are clearly addressed in a table format identifying seven including Educational, Family and Community.</p> <p>Through on going monitoring of data results HCSD plans to make any necessary adjustments that might be called for. The various teams described have a clear plan to carry out. A tracking system based on the selected indicators will demonstrate the results where the students are, how well they are doing, and what will the next steps be. Using this data will help to target resources where needed with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges such as students with disabilities, English language learners, children affected by poverty. STEM offerings are presented, yet weakness is noted in a lack of information as to the ways in which STEM will be guided and strengthened.</p> <p>Clarity is needed on how the gathering of information and dissemination of findings to key stakeholders to ensure that changes and modifications will take place.</p> <p>There is a plan in place to scale the model replication to other schools within the district. Lacking is a detailed plan on how this scale plan will take place from beginning to end.</p> <p>The budget is presented in a detailed manner accompanied with an overall budget summary. The overall budget summary narrative appears clear noting where the money is being placed and how it will be utilized. There is a cost description provided for each of the following areas 1) Personnel; 2) Fringe Benefits; 3) Travel; 4) Equipment; 5) Supplies; 6) Contractual. The items needed but funded by outside resources are also listed.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<div>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</div> <div>Throughout the proposal the absolute priority 1 was addressed with a clear plan in mind of creating learning environments that leads towards the improvement of teaching and learning through the personalization of strategies, tools. Support for all students and educators are aligned with college- and career ready standards or college- and career ready graduation requirements.</div> <div>Each partnership formed is set up to supply support in helping students accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs. The partnership also seeks to increase the effectiveness of educators expanding student access to the most effective educators and decreasing achievement gaps across student groups.</div>		
Total	210	137